

AMWG HBC ad hoc group
Conference call, April 25, 2003

Attendees from the ad hoc group

Agenda

- 1 – discuss potential revisions to draft ad hoc report
- 2 – review of each of the proposed projects
- 3 – comments on proposed time line distributed April 24

Minutes

Comments on the Rich Valdez draft report due to Sam Spiller by **10 am Monday April 28**. Sam Spiller will incorporate into the draft by **10 am Tuesday April 29** for mailing to the AWMG.

Discussion covering each of the proposed projects, revised since the meeting April 21 – 22 in Phoenix.

1 – addition of project purpose, preliminary to reintroduction of native fish to tributaries. Items 5 and 6 will be noted as being considered as a separate project. Mainstem removal in mainstem areas will be expanded in Project 12.

2 – modify proposal to be more general in terms of location of hazardous spills – reference control at Cameron.

3 – project could be combined with project 22, but for now keep separate as a task to be accomplished

7 – projects 7, 8 and 9 should be combined. Need to establish guidelines for propagation-type actions. Translocation actions viewed differently than augmentation. Need to develop propagation plan on propagation and augmentation, including milestones and decision points. Language will be added to the project proposals and the timeline noting this step.

8 – Language to be added to strategy report describing the various elements of increasing the range of HBC (above Chute Falls, other tribes, mainstem)

9 – Remove reference to 30-mile population. Need to reconsider whether this project should be included in the overall strategy. Need to have propagation plan address this project. Is there potential to extirpate this 30-mile aggregation in the wild?

10 – AMP Management Objective cited seems to be out of date – need to update. Focus of project needs to be on management, not just monitoring. Scope of work needs to be clarified whether parasite survey has been completed.

11 – has been expanded to other tributaries and tribal lands. Concern about genetics issues associated with translocation of fish above Chute Falls

12 – expand to other areas of mainstem electrofishing besides the LCR confluence. Should include all non-native fish

14 – Suggested adding workshop of investigators working throughout the Colorado River system to address scientific impacts. Add recreational activities to title, bold “recreational” in citing of Recovery Goals, and consideration of closure of the LCR confluence to recreation users.

Comments on remaining projects should be sent to the authors.